

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: LOWLES, Robert, J.
Serial No.: 10/787,173
Filed: February 27, 2004
Title: HOLSTER FOR SUPPORTING AND CHARGING THE WIRELESS
HEADSET OF HANDHELD DEVICES
Group: 2617
Examiner: MEHRPOUR, Naghmeh
Attorney Ref.: PAT 53955-2 US

February 25, 2008

MAIL STOP - AF

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia
22314-1450
U.S.A.

Dear Sir:

SUBMISSION AFTER FINAL ACTION

The undersigned wishes to thank Examiner Mehrpour for her time in discussing the Final Office Action issued December 13, 2007 in relation to the above-noted application. In our telephone conversation of February 21, 2008, the undersigned explained that it is believed that there was an inadvertent error in this Office Action. More particularly, in the Response to Arguments, it appears that the comments are repeated from a previous Office Action and do not address the Applicant's arguments made in the response dated November 21, 2007. The Examiner requested that the undersigned make a paper submission explaining the facts and requesting that a corrected Action be issued.

As indicated, it is believed that the Final Action issued December 13, 2007 included an error in responding to Applicant's Arguments made in the response dated November 21, 2007.

For example, it is stated "In response to the applicant's argument that "Christal and Kim fails to teach a mating structure for releasably retaining the peripheral device in direct electrical contact with the mobile device when retained in the sleeve so as to permit the mobile to

charge a battery in the peripheral and the features of the present application (such as direct physical contact) does not thought by the references" and a response is provided beginning at page 11 of the Final Action. This section, as quoted, is not found anywhere in applicant's response of November 21, 2007, or in Applicant's response dated July 5, 2007, however.

In another example it is stated "In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references..." and a response is provided at page 12 of the Final Action. Applicant, however, did not present the argument referred to by the Examiner in Applicant's response of November 21, 2007 or in Applicant's response dated July 5, 2007.

It is believed that the response provided is not responsive to Applicant's clarifying amendments and arguments made in an effort to advance prosecution.

The Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration and, as discussed, issuance of a corrected Office Action, if the Examiner deems it necessary.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert J. LOWLES

Borden Ladner Gervais LLP
1200 Waterfront Centre
200 Burrard Street, P.O. Box 48600
Vancouver, British Columbia V7X 1T2
CANADA

By: /Geoffrey de Kleine/
Geoffrey de Kleine
Reg. No. 50,216

Tel: (604) 687-5744
Fax: (778) 329-0752
E-mail: ipmailvancouver@blgcanada.com

GDK